

Chief Judge Marsha J. Pechman

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

**IN RE ELECTRONIC BOOKS ANTITRUST
LITIGATION**

Case No. 12-mc-00186-MJP

NOTICE OF MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

Action Pending in:
United States District Court, Southern District
of New York (11-md-02293-DLC)

Amazon.com, Inc. ("Amazon") moved on Friday to quash a non-party subpoena served

on it by defendants in a consolidated multidistrict litigation (“MDL”) pending before The

Honorable Denise Cote in the Southern District of New York. In a highly confidential

submission, defendants requested permission from Judge Cote, also on Friday, to move to

THE PRACTICAL WORKBOOK, AND APPENDIX, IS MOVE TO

compel Amazon's compliance with that same subpoena. Defendants respectfully request that

this Court transfer Amazon's motion to Judge Cote so that it can be considered with related

issues in the MDL.

It is common for the court handling an MDL litigation to resolve discovery disputes arising from subpoenas served in other districts. Federal law provides that an MDL judge may “exercise the powers of a district judge in any district for the purpose of conducting pretrial depositions in such coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.” 28 U.S.C. § 1407(b). The

vast majority of federal courts to consider the issue have interpreted Section 1407(b) as conferring jurisdiction on the MDL judge over disputes relating to non-party document subpoenas. *See., e.g., U.S. ex. rel. Pogue v. Diabetes Treatment Ctrs. of America, Inc.*, 444 F.3d 462, 469 n. 4 (6th Cir. 2006) (“the rationale underlying the MDL statute . . . requires the conclusion that Section 1407(b)’s grant of authority applies to both deposition subpoenas and documents-only subpoenas”); *In re Welding Rod Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 406 F. Supp. 2d 1064, 1066–7 (N.D. Cal. 2005) (transferring motion to quash document subpoena to MDL judge, who was “readily familiar with the underlying issues” and explaining that “most courts” apply Section 1407(b) to document subpoenas); *In re Subpoenas Served on Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering and Goodwin Proctor LLP*, 255 F. Supp. 2d 1, 2 (D.D.C. 2003) (remitting motion to quash subpoena duces tecum to MDL judge, who was “already familiar with [the] massive litigation” and had consented to hearing motions to quash).¹ The sole case cited by Amazon, *SEC v. CMKM Diamonds, Inc.*, 656 F.3d 829 (9th Cir. 2011), is inapposite because it did not involve an MDL and has nothing to do with Section 1407(b).

There are clear efficiencies in having a single court adjudicate discovery disputes in an MDL such as this, involving 30 different actions from 3 different districts. Furthermore, Judge Cote has presided over these actions for approximately nine months, she is familiar with the issues and parties in the case, and she already has presided over discovery disputes on related

¹ Three years before the holding in *In re Welding*, another court in the Northern District of California held that Section 1407(b) does not apply to document subpoenas. *See VISX, Inc. v. Nidek Co.*, 208 F.R.D. 615, 616 (N.D. Cal. 2002). But several courts have criticized and disagreed with the holding in *VISX*. *See In re Welding*, 406 F. Supp. 2d at 1066 (explaining that *VISX*’s holding does not comport with the purpose of Section 1407 and is contrary to the weight of authority); *U.S. ex rel. Pogue v. Diabetes Treatment Centers of America, Inc.*, 238 F. Supp.2d 270, 275 (D.D.C. 2002) (disagreeing with *VISX* because most courts have extended Section 1407 to the enforcement of document subpoenas); *HCA, Inc. v. U.S. ex rel. Pogue*, No. 3:02-MC-0047, 2002 WL 31953748, at *4 (M.D. Tenn. Nov. 21, 2002) (disagreeing with *VISX*’s holding because it contained “little analysis of the purpose of section 1407(b) or other case law” and finding the reasoning of contrary cases “more persuasive”).

1 issues in the MDL—including another dispute between two parties that relates to Amazon. The
2 parties, recognizing these efficiencies, agreed in their Initial Report that Judge Cote would “to
3 the full extent allowed by law . . . hear any discovery disputes regarding non-party subpoenas
4 served in connection with the actions, including motions to quash or modify and motions to
5 compel.” (Attached as Exhibit A.) In reviewing this section of the draft Joint Initial Report at a
6 status conference, Judge Cote confirmed that she was “happy” to “exercise jurisdiction over
7 discovery disputes.” (See Transcript of 6/22/2012 Status Conference (attached as Exhibit B) at
8 28:5–9.) Accordingly, defendants, as required by Judge Cote’s rules, have filed a pre-motion
9 letter bringing the dispute with Amazon before the MDL court.

11 For these reasons, defendants respectfully request that this Court transfer the present
12 dispute to Judge Cote to be considered as part of the MDL.

13 DATED: September 17, 2012.

14 By s/Christopher B. Wells
15 Christopher B. Wells, WSBA No. 08302
16 wellsc@lanepowell.com

17 By s/Michelle K. Peterson
18 Michelle K. Peterson, WSBA No. 33598
19 petersonm@lanepowell.com

20 LANE POWELL PC
21 1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4100
Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 223-7000

22 *Attorneys for Apple Inc.*

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 The undersigned certifies under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of
3 Washington, that on the 17th day of September, 2012, the document attached hereto was
4 presented to the Clerk of the Court for filing and uploading to the CM/ECF system. In
5 accordance with their ECF registration agreement and the Court's rules, the Clerk of the Court
6 will send e-mail notification of such filing to all CM/ECF participants and any non-CM/ECF
7 participants will be served in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

8 Majorie Alison Walter
9 KIPLING LAW GROUP PLLC
10 3601 FREMONT AVENUE N
11 STE 414
12 SEATTLE, WA 98103
13 206-545-0347
14 Email: walter@kiplinglawgroup.com

- 15
- 16 by **CM/ECF**
17 by **Electronic Mail**
18 by **Facsimile Transmission**
19 by **First Class Mail**
20 by **Hand Delivery**
21 by **Overnight Delivery**

22 Michael E Kipling
23 KIPLING LAW GROUP PLLC
24 3601 FREMONT AVENUE N
25 STE 414
26 SEATTLE, WA 98103
27 206-545-0345
28 Fax: 206-545-0350
29 Email: kipling@kiplinglawgroup.com

- 30
- 31 by **CM/ECF**
32 by **Electronic Mail**
33 by **Facsimile Transmission**
34 by **First Class Mail**
35 by **Hand Delivery**
36 by **Overnight Delivery**

37 *s/ Peter C. Elton*
38 Peter C. Elton